



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/205,037	06/10/88	BEYERSDORF et al	C-34,972 A

EXAMINER	
N Nutter	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
153	12

DATE MAILED:

## EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lisha M. Simmonds (attorney) (3) William H. Keskey (inventor)  
(2) Robert S. Beyersdorf (inventor) (4) Nathan M. Nutter (examiner)

Date of interview 16 March 1989Type:  Telephonic  Personal (copy is given to  applicant  applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:  Yes  No. If yes, brief description: Two ceiling tile samples. (1) Prepared with starch showed discoloration and sagging; (2) Prepared with latex (according to the invention) showed no discoloration nor sagging. The latex sample also  
Agreement  was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question.  was not reached. exhibited greater integrity upon handling.

Claims discussed: all claimsIdentification of prior art discussed: Hen

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Declarations of John Caniva and William Keskey were discussed to clarify the importance of the Tg; modulus of rupture and sag resistance as regards the instant invention. Further, Table I at page 13 was discussed with regards to the Comparative examples of latex and starch. Applicants' comments in view of the Declarations and Table I were deemed to be convincing of

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

patentability. Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.

Nathan M. Nutter  
Examiner's Signature